

**SUPERSYMMETRIC THEORIES ON A NON SIMPLY
CONNECTED SPACE-TIME**

Ashok Das

and

Marcelo Hott[†]Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14627**Abstract**

We study the Wess-Zumino theory on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$ where a spatial coordinate is compactified. We show that when the bosonic and fermionic fields satisfy the same boundary condition, the theory does not develop a vacuum energy or tadpoles. We work out the two point functions at one loop and show that their forms are consistent with the nonrenormalization theorem. However, the two point functions are nonanalytic and we discuss the structure of this nonanalyticity.

[†]On leave of absence from UNESP - Campus de Guaratinguetá, P.O. Box 205, CEP : 12.500, Guaratinguetá, S.P., Brazil

It is well known that quantum field theories at finite temperature lead to some novel features. For example, two point functions as well as higher point functions become non-analytic at the origin in momentum space at finite temperature [1-3]. There are some cases where such nonanalytic behavior does not arise – the simplest example being that of a self-energy which involves unequal masses in the loop [4]. One could possibly also hope for an improved behavior in a supersymmetric theory where bosonic and fermionic loops have a tendency to cancel. Unfortunately, however, supersymmetry is broken at finite temperature [5-6] and, therefore, this cannot be directly tested.

On the other hand, studies of quantum fields on non simply connected space-times have been of interest for quite some time now [7-12]. The simplest of such space-times is $\mathbf{R}^n \times S^1$ which is a prototype of Kaluza-Klein or string compactification. Here a space coordinate is compactified (as opposed to the compactification of the time coordinate at finite temperature in the imaginary time formalism). There have been many studies on such spaces and the calculations, not surprisingly, are remarkably similar to the finite temperature ones. The difference, however, is in the fact that the compactification length has no relation to the physical temperature and, therefore, one is not required to impose periodic boundary conditions on bosonic fields and antiperiodic ones on the fermion fields. (Namely, the generating functional is not a partition function and as a result, the KMS [13] condition need not be satisfied.) Consequently one can require both the bosonic and the fermionic fields to satisfy either periodic or antiperiodic boundary conditions in the hope that supersymmetry is maintained. In this letter, we study a supersymmetric theory – the Wess-Zumino theory – on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$ where one space coordinate is compactified. We show that only when both the bosonic and the fermionic fields satisfy the same boundary condition, the theory does not develop a zero point energy, consistent with supersymmetry, which is quite distinct from the behavior of the nonsupersymmetric theories [9] on such a space-time. We study the two point functions for the bosonic and the fermionic fields at one loop and show that, for either of the boundary conditions (periodic or antiperiodic), they have the required form consistent with the nonrenormalization theorem [14]. However, the two point functions are nonanalytic. We discuss the structure of the nonanalyticity and present a short conclusion.

The Wess-Zumino theory [14] is described by the Lagrangian density (our metric is $(+, -, -, -)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu A \partial^\mu A + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu B \partial^\mu B - \frac{m^2}{2} (A^2 + B^2) + \frac{i}{2} \bar{\psi} \not{\partial} \psi - \frac{m}{2} \bar{\psi} \psi \\ & - g \bar{\psi} (A - i \gamma_5 B) \psi - mg A (A^2 + B^2) - \frac{g^2}{2} (A^2 + B^2)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where A and B are scalar and pseudoscalar fields while ψ is a Majorana spinor. Just to recapitulate some of the salient features of this theory, we note that this theory (in the four dimensional Minkowski space-time) has zero vacuum energy. The tadpoles in the theory vanish and the two point functions have the form

$$\begin{aligned} &= a(k^2 + m^2) \\ &= a(k^2 + m^2) \\ &= a \not{k} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

This shows that the theory needs only a single wave function renormalization constant and this is the essence of the nonrenormalization theorem. (Similar results also follow for the vertex functions, but we will not be concerned with them.)

Next, let us consider the Wess-Zumino theory on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$. We assume that the x^3 coordinate is compactified with a compactification length L . Thus, the momentum along this axis will be discrete and depending on the boundary condition will have values

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\text{Per.}}^3 &= \frac{2\pi n}{L} \\ n &= 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3, \dots \\ p_{\text{Anti.}}^3 &= \frac{2\pi(n + 1/2)}{L} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The four dimensional momentum integration will now become a three dimensional momentum integration and a discrete sum. But for simplicity, we will continue to use the standard notation of a four dimensional integration with the understanding that

$$\int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \equiv \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \cdot \frac{1}{L} \sum_n \quad (4)$$

With these basics, let us note that the generating functional for the free Wess-Zumino theory (when $g = 0$) is simply the product

$$Z = Z_B Z_F \quad (5)$$

where the bosonic and the fermionic generating functionals are given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z_B &= [\det (\partial^2 + m^2)]^{-1} \\ Z_F &= \det (\partial^2 + m^2) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

When the bosons and the fermions satisfy the same boundary conditions, each of these determinants is evaluated on the same space of functions so that the generating functional in (5) becomes unity. This shows that the vacuum energy for the free theory vanishes on this space only when both the bosonic and the fermionic fields satisfy the same boundary condition. When interactions are present, the lowest order vacuum diagrams will be at two loop and have the form

$$\begin{aligned} &= 4im^2 g^2 \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(k^2 - m^2)(p^2 - m^2)((k - p)^2 - m^2)} \\ &= -8ig^2 \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{k \cdot p}{(k^2 - m^2)(p^2 - m^2)((k - p)^2 - m^2)} \quad (7) \\ &= 4ig^2 \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(k^2 - m^2)(p^2 - m^2)} \end{aligned}$$

It is a simple matter to check and see that these diagrams add up to zero algebraically only when both the bosonic and the fermionic fields satisfy the same boundary condition. The analysis can be carried out completely analogous to the conventional analysis order by order and it can be shown that the theory does not develop a vacuum energy when both bosonic and fermionic fields satisfy the same boundary condition. This observation may be quite helpful in the study of string compactification which preserves supersymmetry.

In a similar manner, one can show that the theory does not generate any tadpoles.

Here we just give one example.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 3mg \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{p^2 - m^2} \\
&= mg \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{p^2 - m^2} \\
&= -4mg \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{p^2 - m^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Once again, we see that for the same boundary condition, these terms add up to zero.

Next, let us evaluate the two point functions at one loop. Let us concentrate on the A -field and note that when A , B and ψ satisfy the same boundary condition, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -i\pi_A(k) = 4g^2 \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{2k \cdot (k+p) + m^2}{(p^2 - m^2)((k+p)^2 - m^2)} \\
&= 4g^2(k^2 + m^2) \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(p^2 - m^2)((k+p)^2 - m^2)}
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where k^μ represents the external momentum. We write a four vector $p^\mu = (\hat{\mathbf{p}}, p^3)$ and note that $p^3 = \frac{2\pi n}{L}$ for periodic boundary condition whereas $p^3 = \frac{2\pi(n+\frac{1}{2})}{L}$ for antiperiodic boundary condition (see Eq. (3)). Let us first evaluate the self-energy in (9) for periodic boundary condition. Rotating to Euclidean space, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
-i\pi_A^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) &= -4ig^2(k_E^2 - m^2) \int \frac{d^4 p_E}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(p_E^2 + m^2)((k_E + p_E)^2 + m^2)} \\
&= -4ig^2(k_E^2 - m^2) \int \frac{d^3 \hat{p}_E}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{L} \sum_n \frac{1}{(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_E^2 + (\frac{2\pi n}{L})^2 + m^2)((\hat{\mathbf{k}}_E + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_E)^2 + (k^3 + \frac{2\pi n}{L})^2 + m^2)}
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The sum over n can be performed using the formula

$$\sum_n f(n) = - \sum \text{Res } f(z) \pi \cot \pi z \quad \text{at the poles of } f(z) \tag{11}$$

for any function $f(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $|z| \rightarrow \infty$. We also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \coth \frac{z}{2} &= \frac{e^{z/2} + e^{-z/2}}{e^{z/2} - e^{-z/2}} \\ &= (1 + 2n_B(z)) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where

$$n_B(z) = \frac{1}{e^z - 1} \quad (13)$$

represents the bosonic distribution function. Using Eqs. (11) and (12), the sum in Eq. (10) can be performed and the result has the form

$$-i\pi_A^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) = -i\pi_A^{(0)}(k_E) - i\pi_{A,L}^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) \quad (14)$$

where $\pi_A^{(0)}(k_E)$ represents the L -independent self-energy of the supersymmetric theory in the conventional Euclidean space (namely, $L \rightarrow \infty$ limit) and

$$\begin{aligned} -i\pi_{A,L}^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) &= -4ig^2(k_E^2 - m^2) \int \frac{d^3\hat{p}_E}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{n_B(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \times \\ &\quad \left[\frac{1}{k_E^2 + 2(\hat{\mathbf{k}}_E \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}_E + ik^3\omega_{\hat{p}})} + \frac{1}{k_E^2 + 2(\hat{\mathbf{k}}_E \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}_E - ik^3\omega_{\hat{p}})} \right] \\ &= -\frac{ig^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{(k_E^2 - m^2)}{\hat{k}_E} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E n_B(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \ln R \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\hat{p}} &= (\hat{p}_E^2 + m^2)^{1/2} \\ R &= \frac{(k_E^2 + 2(\hat{k}_E \hat{p}_E + ik^3\omega_{\hat{p}}))(k_E^2 + 2(\hat{k}_E \hat{p}_E - ik^3\omega_{\hat{p}}))}{(k_E^2 - 2(\hat{k}_E \hat{p}_E + ik^3\omega_{\hat{p}}))(k_E^2 - 2(\hat{k}_E \hat{p}_E - ik^3\omega_{\hat{p}}))} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and $\hat{k}_E$ and $\hat{p}_E$ in Eqs. (15) and (16) stand for the lengths of the Euclidian three vectors $\hat{\mathbf{k}}_E$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_E$.

We can, similarly, evaluate the self-energy for the A -field with antiperiodic boundary condition for all the fields. The relevant formula to use for the evaluation of the discrete sum, in this case, is

$$\sum f(2n+1) = \sum \text{Res } f(z) \pi \tan \pi z \quad \text{at the poles of } f(z) \quad (17)$$

and the result is

$$-i\pi_A^{\text{Anti.}}(k_E) = -i\pi_A^{(0)}(k_E) - i\pi_{A,L}^{\text{Anti.}}(k_E) \quad (18)$$

with

$$-i\pi_{A,L}^{\text{Anti.}}(k_E) = \frac{ig^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{(k_E^2 - m^2)}{\hat{k}_E} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E n_F(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \ln R \quad (19)$$

where

$$n_F(z) = \frac{1}{e^z + 1} \quad (20)$$

defines the Fermi distribution function.

The self-energies for the B -field and the ψ -field can be, similarly, evaluated. We note here the results without going into details.

$$= -i\pi_B(k) = -i\pi_B^{(0)}(k) - i\pi_{B,L}(k) \quad (21)$$

where

$$-i\pi_{B,L}^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) = -\frac{ig^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{(k_E^2 - m^2)}{\hat{k}_E} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E n_B(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \ln R \quad (22)$$

$$-i\pi_{B,L}^{\text{Anti.}}(k_E) = \frac{ig^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{(k_E^2 - m^2)}{\hat{k}_E} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E n_F(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \ln R \quad (23)$$

Similarly, for the ψ -field we have

$$= -i\pi_\psi(k) = -i\pi_\psi^{(0)}(k) - i\pi_{\psi,L}(k) \quad (24)$$

with

$$-i\pi_{\psi,L}^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) = -\frac{ig^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{k_E}{\hat{k}_E} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E n_B(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \ln R \quad (25)$$

$$-i\pi_{\psi,L}^{\text{Anti.}}(k_E) = \frac{ig^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{k_E}{\hat{k}_E} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E n_F(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \ln R \quad (26)$$

We note from Eqs. (15), (19), (22), (23), (25) and (26) that when all the fields satisfy the same boundary condition, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} -i\pi_{A,L}(k_E) &= (k_E^2 - m^2)\pi_L(k_E) \\ -i\pi_{B,L}(k_E) &= (k_E^2 - m^2)\pi_L(k_E) \\ -i\pi_\psi(k_E) &= k_E \pi_L(k_E) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_L^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) &= -\frac{ig^2}{2\pi^2 \hat{k}_E} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E n_B(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \ln R \\ \pi_L^{\text{Anti.}}(k_E) &= \frac{ig^2}{2\pi^2 \hat{k}_E} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E n_F(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \ln R \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Once again we see that as long as all the fields satisfy the same boundary condition, the form of the one loop self-energies is consistent with the nonrenormalization theorem (see Eq. (2)). However, we note that, in this case, the self-energies become nonanalytic. It is easy to see that if we set $k^3 = 0$ and then take $\hat{k}_E \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\hat{k}_E \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k^3 \rightarrow 0} \pi_L^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) &= -\frac{ig^2}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{n_B(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \\ \lim_{\hat{k}_E \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k^3 \rightarrow 0} \pi_L^{\text{Anti.}}(k_E) &= \frac{ig^2}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{n_F(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

On the other hand, if we set $\hat{k}_E = 0$ and then take the limit $k^3 \rightarrow 0$, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k^3 \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\hat{k}_E \rightarrow 0} \pi_L^{\text{Per.}}(k_E) &= -\frac{ig^2}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E^2 n_B(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}^3} \\ \lim_{k^3 \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\hat{k}_E \rightarrow 0} \pi_L^{\text{Anti.}}(k_E) &= \frac{ig^2}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty d\hat{p}_E \frac{\hat{p}_E^2 n_F(L\omega_{\hat{p}})}{\omega_{\hat{p}}^3} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

This is exactly the same nonanalyticity seen in the context of finite temperature [1,3] and supersymmetry has not improved this behavior. In fact, supersymmetry only seems to

imply that the nonanalyticity in the bosonic and the fermionic two point functions are the same. Even though we have studied only the Wess-Zumino theory, a little analysis would indicate that the nonanalyticity in the two point functions would be present in any supersymmetric theory on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$ simply because, the fermion self-energy graphs are not of cancelling nature.

In closing, we note that periodic boundary condition for fermions is known to lead to problematic causal behavior for propagators [9]. This can be easily seen from the fact that the quantum corrections to the two point functions have opposite sign corresponding to periodic or antiperiodic boundary conditions. We have not particularly worried as to which boundary condition would be physical in such theories. Rather, we have shown that either of the boundary conditions seem to be consistent with supersymmetry even though they may lead to nonanalytic amplitudes. It may very well be that for such theories the only physical boundary condition is when all fields are antiperiodic in the compact direction. This needs further study, in particular, if we are to take compactification seriously.

This work was supported in part by U.S. Department of Energy Grant No. DE-FG-02-91ER40685. M.H. would like to thank the Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo for the financial support.

References

1. H.A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 1394; *ibid* **D28** (1983) 2007.
2. For a review of the problem and references see P.S. Gribosky and B.R. Holstein, Z. Phys. **C47** (1990) 205; P.F. Bedaque and A. Das, Phys. Rev. **D45** (1992) 2906.
3. H.A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 594; P.F. Bedaque and A. Das, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 601.
4. P. Arnold, S. Vokos, P. F. Bedaque and A. Das, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 498.
5. A. Das and M. Kaku, Phys. Rev. **D18** (1978) 4540.
6. A. Das, Physica A158 (1989) 1.
7. L.H. Ford and T. Yoshimura, Phys. Lett. **A70** (1979) 89.
8. B.S. Kay, Phys. Rev. **D20** (1979) 3052.
9. L.H. Ford, Phys. Rev. **D20** (1980) 933.
10. L.H. Ford and N.F. Svaiter, “One-Loop Renormalization of Self-interacting Scalar Fields in Non simply Connected Space-times”, TUTP-94-18, hep-th/9411109.
11. G. Denardo and E. Spallucci, Nucl. Phys. **B169** (1980) 514.
12. D. J. Toms, Phys. Rev. **D21** (1980) 928.
13. R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Japan 12 (1957) 570; P. Martin and J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. 115 (1959) 1342.
14. See, for example, “Superspace or One Thousand and One Lessons in Supersymmetry”, S.J. Gates, Jr., M. Grisaru, M. Rocek and W. Siegel, Benjamin/Cummings, Reading 1983.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9502027v1>

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9502027v1>